North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Energy, Mineral, and Land Resources, Land Quality Section

DEDMITTED MINI COM	
□ PERMITTED MINE SITE	☐ UNPERMITTED MINE SITE
1. MINE NAME: Triangle Quarry 2. MINE LOCAT 3. COUNTY: Wake 4 PIVED DASIN	
3. COUNTY: Wake 4. RIVER BASIN: N	Puco Parrison Avenue
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	THE PARTY OF THE P
10. PERSON(S) CONTACTED AT SITE: Cole Atkins	N/A
11. PICTURES? X Ves No TAKEN DY	
I I E OF INSPECTION:	
A. Initial Inspection (Unnormitted Mingri	
1. Size of affected land.	(-44-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3-3
2. How was this area measured?	(attach sketch map)
B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites)	(attach sketch map)  Measured by:
L. C. FOHOW-IID Inspection	
13. Date of last inspection. 07/16/2017	
14. Any mining since that date? \( \sum \text{Yes} \) No	
Equipment was in operation at time of inspect	If yes, cite evidence of such mining activity:
15. Was mine operating at time of inspection?	ion.
	Yes No If yes, explain:
16. Is the mine in compliance with the C	J 7 Uniprocess.
16. Is the mine in compliance with the Oper No No N/A If no, explain: See above	ating Conditions of the Permit Yes
No No N/A If no, explain: See above.	
17. Is the mine in compliance with the Declaration	
17. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Condition, explain:	tions of the Permit? X Yes No No N/A
18. Is there any off-site damage? A. \( \subseteq \text{Yes} \) B. \( \subseteq \text{No} \) C. If A, describe the type and severity of the decrease.	M None I
If A, describe the type and severity of the damage.	None observed
If A, describe the type and severity of the damage:	
If B or C, is there potential for offsite damage? Yes 10.	Vo Evalui
10.0	o exhini:
19. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: None	
Hone	
20. 04	
20. Other recommendations and comments: Recent Turbidity curtain in pond noted.	V cooded area batter
Turbidity curtain in pond noted.	by secured area between plant and office noted.
21. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate?	Yes No (Explain) Not Decided
22. Follow-up inchesti	NAPiam) [ Not Keviewed [ N/A
23. No of additional needed? Wes No	Proposed date
22. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No 23. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 24.	Copy of Report sent to approximately 10/21/2012
INSPECTED DV.	10/31/2019
	10/30/2019
Telephone No: (919) 791-4200 DATI	
Convio Gla	
Copy to the Copy to operator	Copy to Mining Specialist
	Copy to winning Specialist

## Summary of observations during site visit to Wake Stone Triangle Quarry (92-10)

Date: 04-05-2019

ON SITE: 11:15 AM (approx.)

OFF SITE: 1:00 PM (approx.)

Weather: 58 degrees; steady moderate rainfall

Summary: Met with David Lee who is the Environmental Manager for Wake Stone at the mine office building. We briefly reviewed the plan set for the mine site and discussed how the mined stone is processed at the site.

The inspection was limited to the areas of the mine site with the potential to impact water quality in the locations referenced in the complaint from Mr. Morris. This included the stone processing area and process water settling ponds, the process water reservoir, the bypass channel, and the North Pond. The bypass channel runs from a culvert under I-40 roughly southwest to northeast through the middle of the permitted area around the process water reservoir to the North Pond. The North Pond is the pond downstream of the process water reservoir. We then walked the receiving channel downstream of the North Pond to its confluence with Crabtree Creek. Alleged accumulation of fines from the mine's stone processing plant in this channel was the subject of the complaint (which included the video posted on

Regarding the processing plant area, the water used in washing the stone is confined within a closedloop system. The runoff produced at the wash screen drains into the process water settling ponds which subsequently drain to the process water reservoir. Most of the fines carried by the runoff settle out into the settling ponds. Any that don't are carried to the reservoir. The water in the reservoir is then reused to wash the stone. The reservoir has an emergency spillway, but Mr. Lee reports that it has not been activated since Hurricane Fran in 1996. Because of this closed-loop approach, none of the process water ever has an opportunity to leave the site.

There are some places where sediment-laden runoff from the mine haul roads and other open areas may enter the bypass channel. The day of the inspection, there was a steady downpour of rain and I did not observe an excessive amount of sediment entering this channel. As I stated before, the bypass channel flows around the process water reservoir and discharges to the North Pond. There was evidence of previous years of deposition of material in the form of a sand bar in the headwaters of the North Pond. Using the age of the woody vegetation growing on this sand bar as a gauge, this has probably been accumulating very slowly over the last 30+ years. This indicates that the North Pond has been very effectively trapping/settling particles in the runoff from the mine site and (upstream of the mine) for many years. To my knowledge, Wake Stone has reported no parameter exceedances as a result of periodic water sampling and testing under their NPDES permit. A review of stormwater records would be needed to confirm this.

In summary, I found no violations either of the mining permit or NPDES SW permit on the day of my visit. I further observed that the visual quality in the stream flowing from the North Pond was virtually indistinguishable from visual quality of the water flowing in Crabtree Creek just upstream of the confluence of these two channels.

Respectfully submitted by: Bill Denton

## North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Energy, Mineral, and Land Resources, Land Quality Section

· -	OTT ACES OF THE
☐ PERMITTED MINE SITE	☐ UNPERMITTED MINE SITE
1. MINE NAME: Triangle Quarry 2. MINE LOCATION 3. COUNTY: Wake 4. RIVER BASIN: New	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
3. COUNTY: Wake 4 PIVED BACING NAME OF THE POCK TO	: Harrison Avenue, Cary, NC
6. OPERATOR: Wake Stone Company in Acres 1	5. CASE:
3. COUNTY: Wake 4. RIVER BASIN: Neu 6. OPERATOR: Wake Stone Corporation ATTN: Co 7. ADDRESS: P.O. Box 190 Knightdale, North Carolina 8. MINING PERMIT # 22.10	le Atkins-Geologist
8. WINING PERMIT # 02 10	
10. PERSON(S) CONTACTED AT SITE: David Lee, Cold 11. PICTURES? Yes No TAKEN BY:	EXPIRATION DATE: March 30, 2021 N/A
11. PICTURES? Ves Na The David Lee, Cole	Atkins
12. TYPE OF INSPECTION:	
A. Initial Inspection (Uppermitted 1781)	
1. Size of affected land: ac ac 2. How was this area measured? B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites) C. Follow-up Inspection	(attack alasta)
2. How was this area measured?	(attach sketch map)
B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites)	Measured by:
C. Follow-up Inspection	
13. Date of last inspection.	
14. Any mining since that date?   Yes   No  Equipment was operating at time of inspection.	
Equipment was operating at time of inspection.	If yes, cite evidence of such mining activity.
15. Was mine operating at time of inspection.  equipment was operating at time of inspection.	S total rates
equipment was operating at time of inspection? Yes	No If yes, explain: As stated above
equipment was operating at time of inspection.	blacet above,
16. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating No N/A If no, explain:	Conditions of the Permit?
No N/A If no, explain:	Yes
17. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Condit If no, explain:  18. Is there any off-site damage? A.  Yes B.  No C. If A, describe the type and severity of the damage:	
If B or C, is there potential for offsite damage?  Yes  N	
	o Explain:
19. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: None	
None None	
20. Other recommendations and comments:  good. Thanks for your cooperation.	
21 Is the Annual Deal	
21. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate?	Yes No (Explain) Not Design 1 7
22 E-II.	N/A
22. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No	Proposed date
22. Follow-up inspection needed?  Yes No No No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 24. (	CODY of Report sent to answer
	- 1. 2. Tehor cacut to obelator
NSPECTED BY: Joe Dupree	DATE
<b>Felephone No:</b> 919-791-4208	DATE July 6, 2017
Copy to file Copy to operator	Copy to Mining Specialist

## North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Energy, Mineral, and Land Resources, Land Quality Section

THE POST OF THE OWN
X□ PERMITTED MINE SITE □ UNPERMITTED MINE SITE
1. MINE NAME: Triangle Quarry 2. MINE LOCATION: 222 Star Ln Cary 3. COUNTY: Wake 4. RIVER BASIN: Neuse 5. CASE:
7. ADDRESS: PO Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545 8. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10 N/A 9. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE: 03/30/2021 N/A 10. PERSON(S) CONTACTED AT SITE: 11. PICTURES? X Yes No TAKEN BY: 12. TYPE OF INSPECTION:
A. Initial Inspection (Unnouncided and Co.
1. Size of affected land: ac. (attach sketch map) 2. How was this area measured? Measured by:  X B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites)  C. Follow-up Inspection  13. Date of last inspection:06/03/2015
14. Any mining since that date? X Yes No If yes, cite evidence of such mining activity: Mining ongoing  15. Was mine operating at time of inspection? X Yes No If yes, explain: Mining at time of inspection
16. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? X Yes No NA
17. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? X Yes No N/A
18. Is there any off-site damage? A.   Yes B.X No C. None observed  If A, describe the type and severity of the damage:
If B or C, is there potential for offsite damage?  Yes X No Explain:
19. Corrective measures needed and/or taken:
20. Other recommendations and comments: As discussed during the inspection walk through, vegetating the access road along the West side of the project near TST-1 & TST-2 would be beneficial
21. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? X \( \text{Yes} \) No (Explain) \( \text{Not Reviewed} \)  22. Follow-up inspection needed? \( \text{Yes} \) Yes X \( \text{No} \) No Proposed date
24. Copy of Report sent to operator
INSPECTED BY: Thad Valentine (Multi Media Group)  Telephone No: (919) 791-4200  DATE 06/08/2015
Copy to file Copy to operator Copy to Mining Specialist

## North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section MINE INSPECTION REPORT

1. MINE NAME	stone Corporation	2. MINING PERMIT #	97-10
3. OPERATOR Wake	Stone Corporation	4. COUNTY U	Vake
5. ADDRESS POF	sox 190 is well-d	" L NC 27545	
6. PERMIT EXPIRATION	N DATE 04/20/2011	7 RIVER BASINI MA.	se
8. Person(s) contacted at	site Paul Pierce		
9. Was mine operating a	t time of inspection? 🗵 Yes	i □ No 10 Pictur	es? D Vec & No
11. Date last inspected: 6	07/03/02 12. Any n	nining since last inspection	O: DIO ZNO
13. Is the mine in complia	ance with the Operating Con-	ditions of the Permit?	Yes No
If no, explain:	operating con-	antions of the fermit:	<1 c2 □ 140
		,	
		عم ٪	
14. Is the mine in complia	ance with the Reclamation Co	anditions of the Dermit?	Voc. D.No.
If no, explain:		silutions of the Permit?	ries 🗆 No
	3		
	**		
	:		
type and severity of the da	deficiencies result in offsite of the deficiencies result in offsite of the deficiency of the deficien		
16. Corrective measures no	eeded and/or taken: None	needed.	
17. Other recommendation	s and comments:		
18. Is the Annual Reclama	tion Report + 🗗 map accurate?	✓ Yes □ No (Explain)	□ Not Reviewed
19. Follow-up inspection no	eeded?  Yes No	Propose	d date/_/
or additional hages	of Inspection Report <u>Ø</u> . 21	. Copy of Report sent to of	
INSPECTED BY: Willy	im H Denter Ti		(date)
Telephone No: (919) 5	71-4700	D <sub>i</sub>	ATE 06 /28/04
White copy to file	Yellow copy to operator	Dink come to Mr	
7 - J	- one weepy to operator	Pink copy to Mining Specie	alist 10/97

1. MINE NAME Triusle Quany 2. MINING PERMIT # 92-10  3. OPERATOR Wake Stone Corp. 4. COUNTY Wake  5. ADDRESS P.O. Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545  6. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE 04/20/2011 7. RIVER BASIN News #1/03-04-02
3. OPERATOR Wake Stone Corp. 4. COUNTY Wake
5. ADDRESS P.O. Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545
8. Person(s) contacted at cite. M. Let. 141/10.
8. Person(s) contacted at site <u>Mike William 5</u> 9. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes No 10. Pictures? Yes No
11 Date last inspected: 07 /25 / 0/ 13 Amount is 10. Pictures?  Yes No
11. Date last inspected: <u>07 / 25 / 0 (</u> 12. Any mining since last inspection? Yes \( \subseteq \) No  13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? \( \subseteq \) Yes \( \subseteq \) No
If no, explain:
If no, explain:
14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit?  Yes  No
If no, explain: No
type and severity of the damage:
16. Corrective measures needed and/or taken:
17 Other recommendations and PA
17. Other recommendations and comments: Refer to enclosed construction detail
roads.
10 To the Avenue I Post of the
18. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +⊕map accurate? ▼Yes □ No (Explain) □ Not Reviewed
19. Follow-up inspection needed?   Yes No Proposed date / /
20. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 1. 21. Copy of Report sent to operator 07/23/02
NSPECTED BY: William H. Senton, It DATE 07/03/02
receptione 140: (114) 1 77-4700
White copy to file Yellow copy to operator Pink copy to Mining Specialist 10/97

# MINE INSPECTION REPORT (PERMITTED MINE)

#### DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCES March 25, 1996

#### **MEMORANDUM**

TO: File, Triangle Quarry (92-10)

FROM: John Holley, Regional Enginee

SUBJECT: Site Visit

March 22, 1996

As a follow-up to an inquiry from the Crabtree Creek Streamwatch, I visited the site with David Lee of Wake Stone to see if any perimeter problems were evident with sediment basins or traps. We found all structures to be in good condition, and no signs of recent soil loss were observed. The previously repaired slope along the creek was in excellent condition.

It appears that the inquiry came as a result of a casual observation of an old pond on the property below the active mine site and near the park. This pond is exempt from the Dam Safety Law of 1967, and was breached before any mining was initiated at the site. I remember seeing the pond during initial site visits when we were evaluating the original plans for the site. The breach is at the right abutment of the dam, and is down to firm material at its base. Although the old PS pipes are exposed due to past erosion, the breach is relatively stable with leaf litter, pine straw and other native cover, as well as exposed weathered and competent rock at the downstream end. This area serves as a spillway for the remnant of the pond, and I did not notice any significant changes in it since I last saw it some 10 years ago. Beavers have built a small dam across the upstream end of the opening, but no problems were observed. Wake Stone chose long ago to leave this dam undisturbed within their buffer along the park because repairing it would involve a significant land-disturbing activity in that vicinity.

I notified the Streamwatch coordinator that no problems were found and that no follow-up action is required.

JLH

## MINE INSPECTION REPORT

1. MINE NAME TOUR CONTROL OF STOLES			-
7. Person(s) contacted at site MANN (2016) 10. Date last inspected: 4 1 2 2 1 9 第 1 12. Is the mine in compliance with the If no, explain:	1. Any mining since last inspec		s ⊠No □ No □ No
13. Is the mine in compliance with the If no, explain:		Permit? ØYes	□ No
14. Did any of the above deficiencies and severity of the damage:		res ⊠No If yes, descri	be the type
15. Corrective measures needed and/o	r taken:		
16. Other recommendations and comm		AM Sommont court	200
17. Is the Annual Reclamation Report	+/- map accurate? Pres	□ No (Explain) □ No	Reviewed
18. Follow-up inspection needed?	on Report 20. Copy of Re		7 8 194 (date)
Phone No: (919) 571 4700	D	ATE <u>5 18 19</u>	4
White copy to file	Yellow copy to operator	Pink copy to Mil	ning Specialist

## MINE INSPECTION REPORT

1. MINE NAME TRIANGLE GO	2. M	INING PERMIT# 92-10
5 ADDRESS 3 2 - 1000 2		4. COUNTY WAKE
7 Person(s) contested at all a	WINITATE NC 27545 6. PERMIT E	EXPIRATION DATE 4-1-2001
7. Person(s) contacted at site by	WII) 222	
o. was mine operating at time of	f inspection? Yes No	9. Pictures? ☐ Yes ☑No
10. Date last inspected: 4/3/9	2 11. Any mining since last inspection?	∑ Yes ☐ No
iz: is the tiltle in combilance Mill	h the Operating Conditions of the Permit?	Yes □ No
If no, explain:		*
13 Is the mine in compliance with	Aho Badaasi'a Oa Iii	
If no explain.	the Reclamation Conditions of the Perm	iit? □ Mo
If no, explain:		
14 Did any of the above deficions	nice requilit in efficient and the second	
and severity of the damage:	cies result in offsite damage?   Yes	No If yes, describe the type
and severity of the damage	result in onsite damage? Tyes L	
15 Corrective measures needed as	ndlor takon:	
is. Concourt incastres freeded at	nd/or taken: MA	
16 Other recommendations and co.	mmonto:	
THROUGHER THE COLD	mments: WORK IS COUTINUING ON	PERIMOTOR BERM. SUEDIVO
ARE WELL MAINTHAN	YRRY COOKS WERY GOOD, ALL SET	MUCH COUNTROL DEVICES
	2	
17. Is the Annual Reclamation Ren	ort +/- map accurate? ☑Yes ☐No	(Evaloin) Dhiet Devision d
The state of the s	Miles Live	(Explain) Unot Reviewed
	***************************************	
18. Follow-up inspection needed?	□ Yes □ No Propos	end data / /
19. No. of additional pages of Inspe	ection Report 20. Copy of Report se	sed date//
hages of mopt	tement riopon Lo. Oopy of Report Se	
INSPECTED BY: Trat factor	DATE	(date) <u>4   28   93</u>
Phone No: (99 ) 571 4700	DATE	1 1 20 1 73
10/ 10/10		
White copy to file	Yellow copy to operator	Pink conv to Mining Committee
• •	copy to oporator	Pink copy to Mining Specialist 9/91
		<i>3/9</i> l

### MINE INSPECTION REPORT

1. MINE NAME TRIANGLE	QUARRY		PERMIT # _ 92	
3. OPERATOR WAKE STOWE	CORP.	4.	COUNTY WA	KE
5. ADDRESS PO BOX 190 K	NIGHTDALE NC	27545 ATT	W: JOHN BR	HTGH
6. Person (s) contacted at site	DAVID LEE		-	
7. Was mine operating at time of in	spection?	es 🗌 No 8. Pio	ctures ?	Yes X No
9. Date last inspected: 6 / 30/	<u>මි</u> ලි 10. Any mining si	nce last inspection?	Yes	
11. Is the mine in compliance with t	he Operating Condition	s of the Permit ?	Yes	No
If no, explain:		-		
10 lo Abo mino in constitution				
12. Is the mine in compliance with	the Reclamation Condit	ions of the Permit?	🛛 Yes 🔲 No	)
If no, explain:		,		
13 Did any of the above deficiencie				
13. Did any of the above deficiencie and severity of the damage:	es result in ottsite dama(	ge? Yes XN	o If yes, desci	ribe the type
14. Corrective measures needed an	d / ortaken:	104 =111-1		
- BEZA STA	Pic is and	WHLAT PAILETS INTO	CKABIREE F	1/15
DE 20 3(V)	BIL/ZET)			
,				
15. Other recommendations and cor	nments: CLA MEUT	Des 10- Desil	1 557/ 44 /4 /	
GROWN COUTR	ON PERLANDA A	PIS THE BEING	WELL MALO	(HWEI).
VERY GOLD	-N 12 CO/(10/C) ///	ENS MEGGGGOT	THE MINE	LOOKS
/				
16. Is the Annual Reclamation Repo	rt + / - map accurate ?	Yes No (Ex		lot Poviousel
	The state of the s	700 C	piani) [ ]	Not Reviewed
17. Follow-up inspection needed?	Yes No	Proposed date _	//	
10 No of salatition to a	, -			
<ol><li>No. of additional pages of Inspec</li></ol>	tion Report	19. Copy of Report sen	it to operator <u></u>	14192
				(date)
NSPECTED BY: TIM HOLLAN		DATE: _	6 1 3	1 92
Phone No: (919) 57/-4700				
White copy to file	Yellow copy to opera	ntor	Pink copy to Minin	ng Specialist
				8/89





	(PERMITTED MINE)
	1. MINE NAME ( ARM) TRANCLE QUAYRY 2. MINING PERMIT # 92-10
	3. OPERATOR WAVE STONE CORP. 4. COUNTY WAKE
	5. ADDRESS P.O. BOX 190 KNIGHTDATE, NC 27545
-	6. Person (s) contacted at site TEO ISCATION
	7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes No 8. Pictures? Yes No
	9. Date last inspected: 1 124 172 10. Any mining since last inspection?
	11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit?  Yes  No
-	THE BUFFER ZONE HAS BEEN RESTORED AND RE-SEEDED
	of MULCHED.
The state of the s	
-	
-	·
	12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit?
	If no, explain: No
	13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? Yes Vi No If yes, describe the type
	and severity of the damage: Yes No If yes, describe the type
	14 Corrective measures pended and total and to
	14. Corrective measures needed and or taken: REMEDIAL PLAN HAS BEEN CARMED OUT SUFFICIENT TO CORRECT THE BUFFER DEFICIENCY
	Die de la constant de
	OF VECTATIVE COVER & CONFLETON OF TREE PLANTAGE
	THE TEANTING,
-	15 Other recommendations and the second seco
	15. Other recommendations and comments: THE BEASTING REPORT MUST BE PENIEWED + APPROVED BEFORE BLASDING CAN RE RESULTED
-	ANO THE WEST HIGHWAY.
_	THE THOUSANTE
1	6. Is the Annual Reclamation Report + / - map accurate ? Yes No (Explain) Not Reviewed
-	
_	
1	7. Follow-up inspection needed? TY Yes Discontinuous Proposed data 20, 7, 90, +
	Proposed date D / 17 / 2
1	7. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No Proposed date 2,7,92 ±  8. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 0. 19. Copy of Report sent to operator 1,24,92
p	(date)
ľ	NSPECTED BY: JPHN HOLLEY / 0, 13 ARBEE DATE: 1, 24 (date) 2 hone No: 99 571-4700 17:45-PM - 1:25-PM
)	hone No: (99) 571-4700 12:45 PM - 1:2.58M
	thite copy to file
•	Yellow copy to operator Pink copy to Mining Specialist
-	8/69

North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources, Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section MINE INSPECTION REPORT (PERMITTED MINE) 1. MINE NAME 2. MINING PERMIT# 3. OPERATOR 4. COUNTY 5. ADDRESS 190 KNIGHTDAZE 6. Person (s) contacted at site DHNNY + TED BRATTON DAVID LEE 7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes 9. Date last inspected: 3 / 27/ 90 10. Any mining since last inspection? Yes 11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? If no, explain: UNDISTURBLD Aron6 12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? If no, explain: 13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? No If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage: ROCK MATERIAN ANTERIALS LOST CRABTRAK 14. Corrective measures needed and / or taken: FOR 15. Other recommendations and comments: THIS EXPANSION AREA EXCELLEN 16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report + / - map accurate? Yes No (Explain) Not Reviewed 17. Follow-up inspection needed? X Yes □ No 18. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 19. Copy of Report sent to operator / // ≥ / 92. INSPECTED BY WHA TRAY DAVIS Phone No: (919)

Yellow copy to operator

Pink copy to Mining Specialist

White copy to file

8.1			
North Carolina	Donardment of Matural Deserver		
Totti Galoina	Department of Natural Resources	and Community	Development
		and community	pevelobilietit
	Division of Land Resources, Land	Omality Caption	
	Division of Land Nesources, Land	CUBINV Section	

(PERMITTED MINE)
1. MINE NAME <u>CARY</u> QUARRY 2. MINING PERMIT # 92-10  3. OPERATOR <u>WAKE STONE COMP</u> 4. COUNTY  5. ADDRESS P.O. BOX 190 KAIGHTDAE NO 70515
5. ADDRESS P.O. BOX 190 KAIGHTDAGE NC 77545 6. Person (s) contacted at site DAVID LEE 7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? LYes No 8. Pictures? 9. Date last inspected: 6/30/89 10. Any mining since last inspection? LYes No 11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? LYes No If no, explain:
12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? Yes No
13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? Yes In offsite damage of the damage:
14. Corrective measures needed and / or taken:  BASINS AND SILT FENCES THE BOOM INSTILLED OUNG THE WESTERN BUNDARY OF THE PIT TO PRIVINE PRITECTION DURING THE RECOCATION OF THE THULL RUND, THESE ARE INPORTANT TEMPORARY DEVICES AND SHOULD BE CHECKED TO Other recommendations and comments:
16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report + / - map accurate ? Yes No (Explain) Not Reviewed
7. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No Proposed date//
8. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 19. Copy of Report sent to operator 3 127,90
NSPECTED BY: GERRICK WEATHERS DATE: 3 127 190
/hite copy to file Yellow copy to operator Pink copy to Mining Specialist





North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section

	(PERMITTED MINE)
	1. MINE NAME TRIMPLE OUARRY 2. MINING PERMIT # 77-10 3. OPERATOR WAKE STANE CORP. 4. COUNTY WARE 5. ADDRESS P.O. BLY 190 KALIGHTDAG AC 27545 6. Person (s) contacted at site TED BIZATION 7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes No 8. Pictures? Yes No 9. Date last inspected: 4 120 188 10. Any mining since last inspection? Yes No 11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? Yes No 15 no, explain:
- - - 1 11	2. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit ? Yes No
1. al	3. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? Yes No If yes, describe the type nd severity of the damage:
14	REPINE .
15	Other recommendations and comments: SITE COOKS VERY (and),
16.	Is the Annual Reclamation Report + / - map accurate ?
18. I	Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No Proposed date / /  No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 19. Copy of Report sent to operator/  PECTED BY: DATE: (a / 30 / 89
White	e copy to file  Yellow copy to operator  Pink copy to Mining Specialist  REV. 9/88

# MINE INSPECTION REPORT Land Quality Section



1. Operator: WAKE STONE 2. Mine Name TRANGLE  3. County: WAKE 4. Is site permitted? Yes No 5. Permit No. 92-10  6. Person(s) Contacted: TED BRATTON  7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes No 8. Pictures? Yes No 9. Date Last Inspected: 6/22/8/10. Any mining since last inspection? Yes No 11. If mine is not under permit cite evidence of recent mining activity:	
12. Are public safety provisions in compliance with the permit? Yes No	
14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the permit?  Yes No If no, explain:	
15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite sedimentation?  YesNo If yes, what measures are needed?	
16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report and map accurate? Yes No If no, explain:	
17. Other recommendations and comments: SITE IS IN EXCRUSIT SIMPE,  DAM IS NOARIAG COMPLETION, RECOMMEND THAT IMPUNDMENT PERMIT BEISSIED. THE ACTIVE OVERBURDEN PILE SHOULD	
BE SCEDED AS SUN AS IT IS COMPLETE BUT NO LATER THAN THIS F  18. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No Proposed date:  19. Copy of report sent to operator? Yes 4125188 No No. of add'1 pages (date)	HU
INSPECTED BY: Select Well Date: 4 120 188	*



# MINE INSPECTION REPORT Land Quality Section



1. Operator: WAKE STONE  2. Mine Name TRIANGLE QUARRY  3. County: WAKE 4. Is site permitted? Yes No 5. Permit No. 92-10  6. Person(s) Contacted: TED BRATTON  7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes No 8. Pictures? Yes No 9. Date Last Inspected: 7/8/8710. Any mining since last inspection? Yes No 11. If mine is not under permit cite evidence of recent mining activity:	
12. Are public safety provisions in compliance with the permit? Yes No  13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the permit?  Yes No If no, explain: But SINE WAS DUSTY (Z~C)	•
14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the permit?  YES NO If no, explain: BERM ON WESTERN END OF  PROPERTY IS NEARING COMPLETION. BRUSH BARRIER & DIVERSIONS  APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN ADEQUATE (MARGINAL). THE SURES  ALONG THALL ROAD ON WEST SIDE OF PIT MUST BE PROVIDED W/GROUNDS.  15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite sedimentation? (PUTENTIAL)  YES NO If yes, what measures are needed? OFFSITE SED WAS MINOR & THE EXISTIALS PITS BETON THALL ROAD (WEST OF PIT) SHOULD COMBE PROVIDED WITH STONE FILTERS AND DIVERSIONS.  SLOPE'S MUST BE STABILIZED.  16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report and map accurate? Yes No If no, explain:	INIC IS IS DE
17. Other recommendations and comments: DON'T USE BRUSH BARRIERS FOR SEDIMENT CONTROL.	
18. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No Proposed date: OCTOBER 27  19. Copy of report sent to operator? Yes 287 No No. of add'l pages (date)	
INSPECTED BY: Levil Weather DATE: 6/27/87	



# State of North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development Raleigh Regional Office

James G. Martin, Governor

S. Thomas Rhodes, Secretary

#### DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCES

February 4, 1987

Mr. John Bratton Wake Stone Corporation Post Office Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545 Ted Bratton 467-4300

RE: Sedimentation Complaint
Wake Stone Triangle Quarry
Wake County

Dear Mr. Bratton:

15 . Lea.

In response to a citizen's complaint of sediment getting into Crabtree Creek from the Triangle Quarry, I inspected the site adjacent to the Creek on February 2, 1987.

I found that spoil material from a large berm is indeed getting into the Creek. Some sediment has gotten through the buffer area at the toe of the slope but the majority of it is leaving the site via several drainage ways.

It was noted that attempts have been made to control the sediment by installing silt fences and hay bales. These measures are inadequate and in some cases have already failed.

Due to this being a rather a large site and in a critical location due to its proximity to Crabtree Creek, it is important that steps be taken immediately to correct the situation. It appears that the first step is to construct sediment basins with stone and gravel filters at the drainage outlets. The next and most important step is to permanently stabilize the berm. This will involve grading the slopes at an angle that will support vegetation.

Mr. Bratton February 4, 1987

2

If needed, I can meet with you or a representative on the site to discuss needed measures.

Please let me know of your intentions as soon as possible. I am at 733-2314.

Sincerely,

- Sto Halland

Tim Holland Asst. Regional Engineer Land Quality Section Raleigh Regional Office

TH/jeb

¢

Land Quality Section
Raleigh Regional Office
3800 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, NC 17611
(919) 733-2314

1.	Company: Wake Stone Corporation 2. County: Wake
3.	Mine: Triangle Quarry 4. Permit No. 92-10
	h. Date Increased a 12 of
7.	Slides Other
8.	Was mine active on date of inspection? Yes No
9.	Erosion Control Measures taken.
į į	been cleaned at and marine to of unstabilized bein have
	been cleaned out and repaired.
10.	Describe any offsite damage. Undetermined amount of sediment lost dawn- stream due to inadequate and toiled measures. No visible siltation noted at time of inspection.
	Are public safety provisions in compliance with permit?
13. I	s Annual Reclamation Report form accurate? Yes No
14. Re	eclamation accomplished since last inspection. No. of acres
	reim next to 1-40 has been planted with pines.
15. Re	clamation measures needed. Remainder of herm must he stabilized.
	her recommendations & comments: Continue to maintain measures next to Captilee Creek. Continue to maintain & tailings ponds.  Recommended to Mr. Brutton to use respedeza in aleas not being stabilized or reclaimed with sines.  The recommendations made to operator at site? Yes No
18. Fol	low-up inspection needed? Yes
INSPECT	ED BY: Tim Holland

MINE INSPECTION REPORT
Land Quality Section
Raleigh Regional Office
3800 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, NC 17611
(919) 733-2314

1.	Company: Wake Stone 2. County: Wake
3.	Mine: Cary Quarry 4. Permit No. 92-10
5.	Person Contacted: Tel Bratten 6. Date Inspected 6-27-86
7.	Pictures: Videotape Slides Other
8.	Was mine active on date of inspection? Yes No
9.	Erosion Control Measures taken. Existing Ponds o Settling Busins
10.	Describe any offsite damage. Nove Noted
11.	Are public safety provisions in compliance with permit?
12.	Waste Disposal measures taken. <u>Berms</u>
13.	Is Annual Reclamation Report form accurate? Yes No
14.	Reclamation accomplished since last inspectionNo. of acresNo. of acres
15.	Reclamation measures needed.
16.	Other recommendations & comments: Looking Good
17.	Were recommendations made to operator at site? Yes No
18.	Follow-up inspection needed? YesNo
19. (	Copy sent to operator? Yes 7-1-86 (date) No
NSPI	ECTED RV. Jon 10 10 11 40

#### MEMORANDUM

TO:

Jim Stevens

FROM:

Steve Conrad 56C

SUBJECT: Inspection of Wake Stone Cary Quarry

Pursuant to our discussions on May 18, 1984, an inspection was made of the Cary Quarry on May 21, 1984. Additionally, the concerns expressed May 18, were discussed with the mine operator.

Problems with truck traffic crossing the centerline were discussed. Wake Stone has indicated that Landmark Associates had plans to develop the property across Reedy Creek Road from the intersection of the Wake Stone access road. The development plans include a redesign of the intersection which may alleviate the truck traffic crossover. Perhaps we can discuss this redesign with Landmark and Wake Stone.

Concerning the reported blasting vibrations, Wake Stone blasted at 1:30 p.m. on April 6, 1984 not at 12:00 p.m. The company's seismograph record for the blast taken at Landmark Engineering across I-40 showed practically no vibration and little air blast. Wake Stone did not blast at all on April 10, 1984, the other date reported. Please check to see if 12:00 p.m. April 6 and 12:30 p.m. April 10 are the correct times. Another possibility for a source of blasting is construction blasting for a pipeline under construction on the south side of I-40 during this period. Wake Stone indicated that the park ranger should feel free to notify them immediately of any problem with blasting as it is easier to investigate the complaint then.

No water was found ponding on the outside of the berm although marsh grass was noted. At this point, we don't feel that additional drainage warrants destroying the adjoining vegetation. However, Wake Stone was advised to monitor the situation and provide drainage if ponding occurs.

Additional vegetative screening was discussed and Wake Stone asked for recommendations. We suggested that your landscaping experts should participate in any recommendations. We will be happy to arrange a meeting to discuss any recommendations with Wake Stone. Construction of the berm along I-40 is on-schedule and is expected to be finished by this fall.

Although Wake Stone acknowledged that they were ahead of their projected production schedule, they could not yet say when the primary crusher could be relocated into the pit.

MEMORANDUM Jim Stevens Page 2 May 22, 1984

4

The mine operator does intend to operate on Memorial Day (May 28). However, they have instituted a policy of not operating at all on Saturdays except for special requests. We did advise them that any request for a variance to operate on times prohibited by permit should be made as far in advance as possible.

Overall, the quarry was found to be in good order and in compliance with the permit on May 21, 1984.

I believe that this addresses the concerns mentioned during the May 18 meeting. We will be happy to coordinate any follow-up discussions on visual screening and intersection redesign.

SC/JS/cj

cc: Paula Burger

			SPECTION REPORT		
	" NAME			County:	WARK
line: _	CARY	QUARRY		Permit Number:	92-10
ate In	spected:	5-04	Date of las	t inspection:	5-17-83
roduct	· CRUSHED	STONE	Person Contacted:		BRATTER
<ul> <li>Remain</li> </ul>	arks - Measures T	aken			
A.	Erosion Control:	- EXISTINI	6 PONDS,	SETTUNG	BASINS
			,		
B.	Waste Disposal: _	BERMS			
C.	Reclamation:	SMBILIZ	ATTION OF C	7091-50	4.04
	6N->1785	Ac uses	c PROCREST	CA TEN	PA _
	REPORTS		120012001	7 7 5 8	1.71.1
COMMEN			CURSMAN		
C	and Aust	SITE	COKSAMI	MLY IN	
. 1	DONES A	Didal Exc	SERMOUS F	ICAR UDYMS	OBJETRUET
P	Roperson	ELAP POR	Selve File	Me T-	40 As
	10-10300.	2 40 A	PREARS SI	77) SFAZTOR	7.
		,			

May 17, 1983

Mr. John Bratton, Jr. Wake Stone Corporation P. O. Box 190 Knightdale, N. C. 27545

RE: Cary Quarry Wake County

Dear Mr. Bratton:

This letter will follow up our meeting and mine inspection of the Cary Quarry on May 17, 1983 in accordance with G.S. 74-56 of the Mining Act.

During our meeting, we discussed continuing noise abatement measures, extending the present berm to the south to provide additional screening, filling small pools of standing water, sediment control, paving the access road, and hauling material from the quarry on Saturday. Through our discussion with you and inspection, we have found that the agreed noise abatement measures have been taken and the existing lakes are still functioning for sediment control. You indicated that the access road will be paved in the near future and the pools will be backfilled and revegetated. We also discussed that hauling overburden from the site on Saturdays will be considered subject to mining permit condition number 5H. Additionally, we appreciate your consideration to extending the berm to the south.

A report of oil contaminated water discharge from your operation to Crabtree Creek was investigated. No evidence of any oil contaminated water discharge was found where your site drainages meets Crabtree Creek.

Thank you for your cooperation in these matters.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

James D. Simons, C.P.G.S., P.E. Mining Specialist LAND QUALITY SECTION

JDS:gf

cc: John Holley

INSPECTED BY:	JOHN	the lay	
1 1			

	/
/	
NO.	

Company	- COMICE	NONE		county:	WITKE
Mine: _	CARY	QUARRY		Permit Number	92-10
Date In	aspected: 3-3	1-82	Date of las	t inspection:	3-9-62
14		•	Person Contacted:		,
I. Rem	marks - Measures Ta	aken	QUAR	LRY PHONE	: <del>467 - 8638</del> 461 - 4300
Α.	Erosion Control:	EXISTING	PONDS AND	Pock	PILTER & PIT
	AT EAST	ERN DRAS	NAGE CHANI	NEL.	
			·		
в.	Waste Disposal:	BERN	И		
C.	Reclamation:	BERM AND	O EASTERN D	MANAGE C	HANNEL HAVE
	BEEN S	EEDED IMUL	CHEP, AND 7	ACKED AS	s well As
		,	8	•	
RECOMME	BEEN LINA NDATIONS & COMMENT	ED WITH RI	P-RAP.		Y ON DAM 150
:		•			Compliance.
_	,		E FILL WE		
:					SSED WITH
					OCUPY A
	,		OP OF THE		
					BERM ALONG
					REENING AND
					HE SCOPES
					E EXPOSED
					E SLOPE
					r STREAM
	SEDIMEN	T POND.	I NOTED	THAT	LATES TO THE EDION'T (Sue)
eficier 	ncy letter needed		Letter sent	Reinspe	ection Needed
1					

THINK THIS DUDOLD BE ANY POBLEM FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE MINING ACT AS LONG AS

THE CONDITIONS OF THE MINING PERMIT ARE

NOT VIOLATED IN THE PROCESS. IT WAS AGREED

THAT I WOULD CHECK THIS THROUGH

JIM SIMONS BEFORE THE ACTIVITY IS UNDERTAKEN

NOTE: JTM SIMONS AND STEVE CONRAD VISITED

SITE 4-2-82 AND OBSERVED THE AREA DESCRIBED

ABOVE. IN A CONVERSATION WITH JTM, I WAS

INFORMED THAT THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IN THE

AREA IS ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED THAT FILL PLACE—
MENT AND STREAM RELOCATION ARE ACCEPTABLE

TO ANY POTENTIALLY AFFECTED NEIGHBORS. JTM.

ASKED ME TO PASS THIS ALONG TO ME.

BRATTEN DURING MY NEXT CONVERSATION

WITH HTM.

THIS WAS ACCOMPLISHED 4-5-82 MH

Inspectéi	BY:	JOHN HODEY
-----------	-----	------------

( )	
V:V	

NO.

Company: LNAKE STUNE	County: WARE
Mine: CARY QUARRY	
Date Inspected: 4-22-82 Date of las	t inspection: 33-31-82
Product: CRUSHED STONE Person Contacted:	JOHNNY BRATTEN
I. Remarks - Measures Taken	
A. Erosion Control: EXISTIM PONOS	
B. Waste Disposal: ON-SITE FILE A	
PRANT SITE - BERM 15	COMPLETEDS TO
EAST OF SITE.	
C. Reclamation: RERM AND EASTERN	
HAVE BEEN STABILIZED; ALSO	N.E. POND DAM.
RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS: No Problem	
TO SEDIMENT CONTROL. I INC	DICATED THAT JIM
SIMONS/ HAD EXPRESSED SOME	
ENDWITH RESPECT TO GO PONO	
IN THE EASTERN DRANKOE	
REOVESTED THAT THESE AREA	
PROPER DRANAGE + MR. 1	
HE INDICATED THAT HE L	
OFFICE AFTIER THE PROBLEM	HAS BEEN CORRECTED.
Deficiency letter needed Letter sent	Reinspection Needed

INSPECTED BY: JOHN SULEY

NO.		
7400		
	Constitution of the Consti	

Company: WAKE STONE	County: ( A)
CARRY QUARRY	Permit Numbers 92-10
Date Inspected: 5-/7-52 Date of las	t inspections $4-22-6$
Product: CRUSHED STONE Person Contacted:	Chatter Party Party
1. Hemarks - Measures Taken	
A. Erosion Control: EXISTING POND	2.0
B. Waste Disposal: ON -SITE FILE	Fra P.
CONSTRUCTION 4 SOLD 1	AS BACK
MATERIAL	BORROW
C. Reclamation: BERM AND EASTERN	
STABILITED AS INFL.	DRAINAGE CHANNEL
STABILITED AS WELL AS N.	E. POND DAM.
RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS:	
RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS: NO SEDIMENT	GNTROL PROBLEMS -
PLANT SHOULD BE OPERA	TRONAL IN ABOUT
AGAIN AROUT D	S HAD CARLED
AGAIN ABOUT PONDING OF	SURFACE
TOHNNY BRATTON	NAGE DITCH.
DOHNNY BRATTEN HAS DRA ABOUT A 100' SELTING	NED ALL BUT
JECIAN MI	UPPER ENO.
महें ।	WILL CONTACT
THE FUT	RE DITCH IS
DRANEO.	
Deficiency letter needed Letter sent	Reinspection Needed

INSPECTED	BY:	JOHN _	HOLLEY
-----------	-----	--------	--------

NO.	
1100	

County: WAKE
Permit Numbers 92-10
of last inspection: 5-12-62
acted: Rowning
<u> </u>
TRUCTION FILL
Solo
EN DRAINAGE CHANNEL
NO OTHER NEW
PROBLEMS.
A SIGNIFICANT GULLY
NEEDS REPAR
ANT GULLIET ARE
NEED PEPAR.
D TO CONTRACTOR AT
en was made a
COMPLETED SLOPES
- PLANS TO PROCEED
TONTH TUNNTH
Reinspection Needed

INSPECTED	BY:	JOHN (	Housey	
			N TOUR	

W

NO.

company: WAKE STONE	County: WAKE
Mine: CARY OVARRY	Permit Numbers 92-10
Date inspected: Date of	f last inspection: (-24-82
Product: CRUSHED STONE Person Contact	cted: BROWNING
Temarks - Measures Taken	
A. Erosion Control: EXISTING PONOS	4 NEW SETTLING
BASINS BELOW PLANT ARE	DA
B. Waste Disposal: BERMS & ON-	SITE CONSTRUCTION FILL
C. Reclamation: BERN AND PRAINTS C	HANNEL TO EAST, BERM
, ICE POND DAM, UPPER	SLOPES OF PIT ARCESS
RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS: CONSTRUCTION AC	MOST COMPLETE.
LICOSION PRUBLEMS WOTED IN	LAT PEROT II AL
DOME MITENTION, HOWE	USR MORE 10
DESDED. NO SEDIMENT PROBLEM	L KATED
THE COLUMN SUGGESTED TO BRO	WHING THAT
THE CREST OF THE NE POND	DAN BE ALTERED
TOOK FROM TOOK	OVER D.S. FACE.
MR. BROWNING INTERCATED THAT	THEY WILL CONTINUE
TO PREGRESS W/ EROSION REPAR	L STABILIZATION.
T RACO	
I RECOMMEND AND IN	ISP. LATER THIS
FAM WHEN CONSTRUCTION IS	Complett.
Dografia	
Deficiency letter needed No Letter sent	Reinspection Needed

INSPECTED, BY:	MIOT	LA . EV	4 JIM	SIMON
THOT HOTTHY DIS	00137-	TRACTO		C Company
A . C		,		

NO.	
7100	

Company:	WAKE	STONE.		County:	WAKE
Mine: _	CARY ON	iARPY		Permit Numbe:	r: 92-10
Date Ins	spected:	3-82	Date of las	t inspection:	9-2-82
	CRUSHED.				
	ırks - Measures Taker				
A.	Erosion Control:	EXISTING	PONOS	+ NEN	J SETTLING
	BASINS				
В.	Waste Disposal:	BERMS	+ ON-31	TE CON	78UCTON
r	Reclamation: BER  TO WEST;  ACCESS ROO	NE PONE	DAM	ANNEL TO	SLOPES OF PIT
	•				y C 2.15
	E OPERATTO				LY COMPLETE.
201					D. COMPLETION
	OR BEER				
	NE POND				
					IN EASTERN
	DRANNAGE	CHAMMAN.			
					MINED BY
		PT OR			
		ABATEM	ENT Ha	DUST	GNAME
	APPEARS	OK.			
•					
			·		
Deficien	cy letter needed	Let	tter sent	Reinsp	ection Needed

November 24, 1982

Mr. John Bratton, Jr. Wake Stone Corporation Post Office Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545

Dear Mr. Bratton:

RE: Cary Quarry (92-10)
Wake County

This is to confirm the results of our inspection of the subject site on November 23, 1982.

As we discussed, reclamation activities and conservation practices carried out to date were found to be in compliance with the provisions of your Mining Permit. We particularly appreciated your assistance with our inspection of the noise abatement measures carried out to date. The work you have done in this area is also in compliance with your permit.

The following items were noted which need your timely attention to insure continued compliance:

- (1) Completion of repair and stabilization work for eroded areas at the Northeast pond dam and Eastern Berm.
- (2) Improvement of drainage within the Eastern Drainage Channel to eliminate the ponding area adjacent to the park property.

In addition to the above, I would recommend that any planned additional seeding work proceed as soon as possible due to the rapidly approaching winter season.

Your cooperation in resolving these matters is appreciated. If there are any questions or if we can be of any assistance, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

John L. Holley, Jr. Regional Engineer Land Quality Section

JLH/mp

cc: Jim Simons

# Wake Stone Corporation

Locations
U. S. 64 East, Raleigh, N.C.
U. S. 1 at Deep River, Moncure, N.C.
I-40 at Harrison Ave., Cary, N.C.

Quarry Phone Numbers: 919/266-9266-- Knightdale 919/775-7349-- Moncure 919/467-4300-- Triangle

Business Office Address: P. O. Box 190 Knightdale, N.C. 27545 919/266-9266

November 29, 1982

Mr. James D. Simons
Division of Land Resources
N. G. Dept. of Natural Resources & Community Development
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, N. C. 27611

Dear Jim:

I am writing to notify you that we have taken care of the recommendations you and John Holley made on your visit to Triangle Quarry last week. Also, please find enclosed a copy of the Bureau of Mines report regarding noise abatement. If you have any questions about the report, please don't hesitate to ask as we might be able to simplify some of Foster-Miller's descriptions.

Yours truly,

WAKE STONE CORPORATION

nn R. Bratton

JRB/cw

Enclosures

RECEIVED

NOV 30 1982

LAND QUALITY SECTION

DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCES

Steumen G. Conrad. Director

Telephone 919 733-3833

December 13, 1982

Mr. John R. Bratton Wake Stone Corporation P. O. Box 190 Knightdale, North Carolina 27545

Dear Mr. Bratton:

Thank you for sending a copy of the Bureau of Mines Report.

We appreciate your cooperation during the November 23rd inspection.

During a recent trip to Umstead Park, I did notice that the gulley on the berm at the park boundary had been filled and mulched. I also noticed that some effort had been made to drain the pools adjacent to the middle of the berm. However, the pools were still present on December 7th and apparently will require some additional effort to drain.

Again, we appreciate your cooperative spirit and look forward to following the progress on your quarry.

Sincerely,

James D. Simons, C.P.G.S., P.E.

Mining Specialist LAND QUALITY SECTION

JDS:pg

cc: John Holley